

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 1, 2005, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 2 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found at least on page 5, line 17 of the Specification as originally filed. Claims 1 and 2 are pending and respectfully submitted for consideration.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Kudo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,223,349, "Kudo"). The Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully submit that Kudo does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of the invention.

As noted above, claims 1 and 2, as amended, recite an insulating layer provided at an outermost periphery thereof. In contrast, Kudo merely discloses a core 1 and a copper cladding layer 2. See column 1, lines 13-15 of Kudo. As such, Kudo does not disclose each and every feature of the invention as recited in claims 1 and 2.

According to U.S. patent practice, a reference must teach every element of a claim in order to properly anticipate the claim under 35 U.S.C. §102. In addition, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628,631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "Every element of the claimed invention must be arranged as in the claim. . . . [t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the

patent claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Accordingly, Kudo does not anticipate claims 1 and 2, nor are claims 1 and 2 obvious in view of Kudo. As such, the Applicants submit that claims 1 and 2 are allowable over the cited art.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection, allowance of claims 1 and 2, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 107156-00233.**

Respectfully submitted,



Rhonda L. Barton
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,271

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RLB/elz/vdb

TECH/396323.1